DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 103 JC 880 577

TITLE Report on the Study of Community College Professional Development Programs and Activities in Illinois Public Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Illinois Community Coll. Board, Springfield.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrators; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Financial Support; Full Time Faculty; Part Time Faculty; *Professional Continuing Education; *Professional Development; Questionnaires; Sabbatical Leaves; *School Personnel; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

In spring 1988, a survey was conducted to examine the nature and scope of the professional development activities provided by the Illinois community colleges for full- and part-time teaching faculty, administrators, other non-teaching professionals, and classified staff. Study findings, based on responses from 36 (92.3%) of the districts, included the following: (1) 22 of the districts had a formal professional development program, while a total of 30 conducted professional development activities at least informally; (2) 88.9% of the districts provided funds for off-campus conference attendance and professional travel for full-time faculty; (3) in fiscal year 1987, 72.2% of the districts awarded paid sabbatical leaves to full-time faculty, but no district offered sabbatical leaves to part-time faculty; (4) the most prevalent development activities open to part-time instructors were on-campus workshops conducted by college personnel and orientation programs; (5) professional travel funds and provisions for off-campus conference attendance were available for administrators at 91.7% of the districts; (6) the most common provision for classified staff was tuition waivers for courses at their own college; (7) the most common incentives used to encourage full-time faculty participation were released time and attendance requirements; (8) in 19 districts, professional development activities were funded as a line item in departmental/divisional budgets; (9) 88.9% of the districts used the college general operating fund as the primary funding source; (10) informal feedback was used to evaluate professional development activities in 86.11% of the districts; and (11) presidents or vice presidents coordinated professional development activities at 41.7% of the districts. The survey instrument is included. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300103

REPORT ON THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES IN ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V.K. McMillan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Illinois Community College Board
509 South Sixth Street, Room 400
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1874
Telephone: (217) 785-0123
September 1988

JC 880 577

Illinois Community College Board

REPORT ON THE STUDY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES IN ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A survey to examine the nature and scope of professional development activities at Illinois public community colleges during fiscal year 1987 was conducted by Illinois Community College Board staff in spring 1988. This survey was requested by the ICCB Finance Advisory Committee in order to obtain information on the nature and scope of staff development activities currently provided by Illinois community colleges. This information is needed to determine the most appropriate state funding to support such activities. It is also needed to justify a request for staff development funding with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Bureau of the Budget, and the Legislature. Information was gathered pertaining to the following employee groups: full-time and part-time teaching faculty, administrators, other non-teaching professionals (including librarians, counselors and instructional support staff), and classified staff. Thirty-six college districts responded to the request for data, yielding an overall response rate of 92.3 percent. Information from a recent Illinois Board of Higher Education survey has been included in this report to supplement the ICCB survey data.

Professional Development Activities

For the purposes of the survey, a formal professional development program was defined as: "A formally organized plan with goals, a budget, and coordinator(s) that includes growth-oriented practices designed to renew or assist employees make positive work-related changes." The survey results showed that all of the college districts had either a formal professional development program, informally conducted professional development activities, or a combination of both. Twenty-two college districts (61.1 percent) indicated they had a formal program, and 30 districts (83.3 percent) stated they informally conducted professional development activities.

The colleges were provided with a listing of 28 possible professional development practices. (See Survey Instrument in Appendix.) All of the practices had some degree of participation during fiscal year 1987. The key professional development activities provided for full-time and part-time teaching faculty during fiscal year 1987 are presented in Table 1. Eight of the professional development activities were reported as having full-time teaching faculty participation by 75 percent or more of the college districts. Professional travel funds and off-campus conference attendance/ presentations by full-time teaching faculty existed in 32 districts (88.9 percent). Tuition waivers for courses in their own colleges were used for full-time teaching faculty in 31 districts (86.1 percent).

Four related activities (college personnel conducted on-campus workshops, outside expert conducted on-campus workshops, on-campus conference attendance/ presentations, and beginning-of-year orientation for new personnel) had full-time teaching faculty participation in 28 districts (77.8 percent). In-service days or specific days designated for professional development for full-time teaching faculty existed in 27 college districts (75 percent).

Table 1

FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME TEACHING FACULTY
PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Off-campus conference attendance/presentation	32	88.89%	12	33.33%
Professional travel funds	32	88.89	7	19.44
Tuition waiver for courses at own college	31	86.11	10	27.78
College personnel conducted on-campus workshops	28	77.78	23	63.89
Beginning-of-year orientation for new personnel	28	77.78	22	61.11
Outside expert conducted on-campus workshops	28	77.78	19	52.78
On-campus conference attendance/presentation	28	77.78	18	50.00
Inservice day(s) or specific days designated for professional development	27	75.00	13	36.11
Paid sabbatical leave	26	72.22	0	0.00

Twenty-six districts (72.2 percent) had full-time faculty participate in their paid sabbatical leave program. Data concerning sabbatical leaves also were gathered through the survey conducted by IBHE in spring 1988. According to that survey, all but one district indicated they have a sabbatical or educational leave policy for full-time teaching faculty. However, during fiscal year 1987, thirteen districts did not award any sabbatical leaves due to budget constraints or having received no applications. The number of sabbaticals granted by the other districts ranged from one to seven faculty per college during fiscal year 1987. Most of the leaves supported projects for advanced study, traveling for research study, developing instructional materials, updating knowledge/skills (particularly in the computer area), and retraining in another discipline. In addition, the IBHE survey results indicated that several colleges designated special in-service days ranging from one to ten days each semester for in-service activities designed to improve the quality of instruction.

According to ICCB survey data, the most prevalent professional development activities with part-time teaching faculty participation were on-campus workshops conducted by college personnel in 23 districts (63.9 percent) and beginning-of-year orientation for new personnel in 22 districts (61.1 percent).

The key professional development activities with participation by administrators, other non-teaching professionals, and classified staff are given in Table 2. Five of the activities for administrators were reported by 75 percent or more of the college districts. Professional travel funds and provisions for off-campus conference attendance/presentations were available for administrators in 33 college districts (91.7 percent). Twenty-seven (75 percent) districts also offered tuition waivers for courses at their own colleges, on-campus workshops conducted by outside experts, and on-campus conferences for their administrators.

Table 2

ADMINISTRATORS, OTHER NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS, AND CLASSIFIED STAFF PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Administrators		Other Non-Teaching Professionals		Classified	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Off-campus conference attendance/presentation	33	91.67%	29	80.56%	21	58.33%
Professional travel funds	33	91.67	30	83.33	16	44.44
Tuition waiver for courses at own college	27	75.00	28	77.78	33	91.67
Outside expert conducted on-campus workshops	27	75.00	24	66.67	24	66.67
On-campus conference attendance/presentation	27	75.00	24	66.67	18	50.00
College personnel conducted on-campus workshops	25	69.44	26	72.22	24	66.67
Newsletter (in-house)	24	66.67	23	63.89	24	66.67

Three professional development activities had participation by other non-teaching professionals in more than 75 percent of the districts. Professional travel funds were used by other non-teaching professionals in 30 districts (83.3 percent). Also, the other non-teaching professionals participated in off-campus conferences in 29 districts (80.6 percent) and in tuition waivers for courses at their own colleges in 28 districts (77.8 percent).

The most common professional development activity provided for classified staff was tuition waivers for courses at their own college, as reported by 33 districts (91.7 percent). Classified staff from 24 college districts (66.7 percent) participated in on-campus workshops conducted by college personnel and by outside experts. Likewise, 24 districts produced an in-house newsletter for classified staff.

All of the college districts reported that some type of professional development activities were provided for administrators, other non-teaching professionals, and classified staff. All but one district that returned a completed survey indicated they provided professional development activities for full-time teaching faculty, and all but three districts indicated that provisions were made for some type of professional development activity for part-time teaching faculty.

As reported in the IBHE survey, several unique professional development practices exist in the community college districts. Moraine Valley Community College operates a Center for Faculty and Program Excellence which funds seven resource instructors to provide instructional assistance to faculty. College of Lake County has a Professional Growth Center which is coordinated by faculty with released time. College of DuPage provides an Instructional Design Office with two full-time professional staff members to assist instructors in developing new courses and alternative methods of delivering existing courses. The Black Hawk College district has certified two faculty members as "Teacher Excellence, Student Achievement" (TESA) instructors, who lead instructional improvement sessions where 34 faculty participants observed their colleagues in action.

Five community college districts are providing professional development opportunities to faculty through membership in the national Community College Exchange Program (CCEP), sponsored by AACJC. They include the City Colleges of Chicago, Joliet Junior College, Illinois Central College, Illinois Eastern Community Colleges, and Moraine Valley Community College districts.

Rewards/Incentives

Table 3 lists the rewards/incentives used by districts to encourage participation in professional development activities during fiscal year 1987. The most common reward/incentive used to encourage full-time teaching faculty participation were released time by 25 districts (69.4 percent), required participation by 20 districts (55.6 percent), and advancement on the salary schedule by 19 districts (52.8 percent). Fewer rewards/incentives were reported as being used to encourage part-time teaching faculty participation in professional development activities. The most common incentives used for

part-time faculty were required participation by eight districts (22.2 percent) and the awarding of certificates of participation by seven districts (19.4 percent).

Table 3

REWARDS/INCENTIVES USED TO ENCOURAGE
FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY PARTICIPATION
IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Full-time Teaching Faculty		Part-time Teaching Faculty	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Participation is required	20	55.56%	8	22.22%
Released time	25	69.44	4	11.11
Advancement on the salary schedule/salary increases	19	52.78	2	5.56
Certificate of participation	10	27.78	7	19.44

As presented in Table 4, the most common rewards/incentives used to encourage administrator involvement were required participation by 18 districts (50 percent), released time by 13 districts (36.1 percent) and certificates of participation by nine districts (25 percent). The most common rewards/incentives used as encouragement for participation for other non-teaching professionals included released time by 20 districts (55.6 percent), required participation by 19 districts (52.8 percent), and certificates of participation by eleven districts (30.6 percent). Those rewards/incentives most commonly used for classified staff were released time by 14 districts (38.9), required participation by 13 districts (36.1 percent), and certificates of participation by nine districts (25 percent). Three districts (8.3 percent) reported that no rewards/ incentives were being used to encourage participation in professional development activities. Merit pay was the least reported reward/incentive used to encourage participation in professional development activities by all of the groups.

Table 4

REWARDS/INCENTIVES USED TO ENCOURAGE ADMINISTRATOR, OTHER NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONAL, AND CLASSIFIED STAFF PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Administrator		Other Non-Teaching Professionals		Classified	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Participation is required	18	50.00%	19	52.78%	13	36.11%
Released time	13	36.11	20	55.56	14	38.89
Certificate of participation	9	25.00	11	30.56	9	25.00
Advancement on the salary schedule/salary increases	2	5.56	8	22.22	4	11.11

Funding of Professional Development Activities

Table 5 shows the budgetary mechanisms used to fund professional development activities. A line item in the department/division budget was used by 19 districts (52.8 percent), one single institutional line item was used by 12 districts (33.3 percent), and various other methods are used to budget for professional development at 15 districts (41.7 percent). Two districts (5.6 percent) made no provision in the budget for professional development activities.

Table 5

METHODS USED TO BUDGET FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Line item budget by department/division	19	52.78%
One single institutional line item	12	33.33
Other	15	41.67
No budgetary provision for professional development	2	5.56

Complete data reveal that the level of funding provided for professional development programs varies substantially by district. Table 6 indicates that nearly ninety percent (88.9 percent, n=32) of the districts used the college general operating fund as the primary funding source for professional development programs. With a median of $40,413, the college general operating fund is over four times as large as the median dollar amount available through the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) ($10,000) Quality Assistance Plan (QAP) Grant--the second largest and second most popular funding source (n=25, 69.4 percent). DAVTE's Adult Education Grant was used to fund professional development programs by nearly half (47.2 percent, n=17) of the responding districts with a median dollar amount of $3,600. One-third of the districts (33.3 percent n=12) received DAVTE Vocational Instructor Practicum (VIP) Grant monies with a median amount of $5,000. Thirteen districts (36.1 percent) mentioned other funding sources.

Table 6

SOURCE OF FUNDS AND AMOUNT SPENT ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Lowest Dollar Amount	Highest Dollar Amount	Median Dollar Amount
College General Operating Fund	32	88.89%	$2,000	$560,000	$40,413
DAVTE QAP Grant	25	69.44	2,250	165,600	10,000
DAVTE Adult Education	17	47.22	500	134,053	3,600
DAVTE VIP Grant	12	33.33	1,345	90,000	5,000
ICCB Disadvantaged Student Grant	14	38.89	430	119,000	1,550
Other	19	52.78	540	546,561	3,000

The college districts' expenditures for professional development represent less than one percent of the fiscal year 1987 college operating budget in 22 districts (61.1 percent). In 13 other districts (36.1 percent), the professional development expenditures represent one to four percent of the total fiscal year 1987 college operating budget. In Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges recommends that, "...at least two percent of the instructional budget at every community college be set aside for professional development." (p. 14) Using the Commission's two percent criterion as the standard indicates that nearly two-thirds (61.1 percent) of the responding districts have not reached the half-way mark of achieving this goal.

Evaluation of Professional Development Activities

A variety of techniques were used by some of the college districts to evaluate the professional development activities. As given in Table 7, the most common evaluation techniques used include informal feedback by 31 districts (86.1 percent), questionnaires in 27 districts (75 percent), and written reports by participants in 24 districts (66.7 percent). Observation was used to evaluate the professional development activities by 16 districts (44.4 percent). The least used evaluation technique was test scores which were only reported by three districts (8.3 percent). Only two districts (5.6 percent) indicated that there was no evaluation of the professional development activities they conducted.

Table 7

TECHNIQUES USED IN THE EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Informal feedback	31	86.11%
Questionnaire	27	75.00
Written report by participant	24	66.67
Observation	16	44.44
Interview	7	19.44
Records, logs, diaries	5	13.89
Test scores	3	8.33
No Evaluation	2	5.56

Planned Initiatives

Several projects or initiatives designed to improve the quality of instruction are currently underway or being planned by individual colleges. At least 15 of the college districts indicated they were enhancing their professional development efforts through increased funding, offering additional in-service activities, and/or assigning coordination responsibility for staff development to a specific position. McHenry County College is opening a Faculty Development Center equipped with microcomputers to assist faculty in their

efforts to incorporate microcomputers in their instruction. Other college districts are giving special emphasis to improving specific curricula. Areas targeted by the districts included: critical thinking skills and computerized instruction, increasing student retention, and improving articulation and academic advising. In this regard, Kaskaskia College has a "President's Risk Fund" for faculty to use in developing new curricula or services; Black Hawk College is holding a DACUM workshop to develop outcomes for specific courses; Triton College is hosting three-tiered articulation meetings with college, high school, and transfer institutions where selected general education courses are discussed; and Waubonsee Community College formed a telecommunications instructional consortium with four area high schools to share instructors and staff development activities related to curriculum development.

Administrative Structure of Professional Development Activities

The responsibility for district-wide coordination of professional development activities was fairly evenly distributed among four administrative levels: presidents, vice presidents, deans, and directors/coordinators. Individuals occupying presidencies and vice presidencies jointly accounted for 41.7 percent of the persons who coordinate district professional development programs. Only three districts (8.3 percent) assigned a title of director/coordinator of staff development to the person who coordinates the professional development program and one district had an assistant to the vice president for professional development. One district had not assigned the professional development responsibilities to any one person.

Various committee structures exist in 29 districts (80.6 percent) to assist with professional development activities. As shown in Table 8, the most common committee structure was for one committee representing all groups to assist with professional development activities (47.22 percent). Five of these districts have separate subcommittees for individual employee groups in addition to an overall committee which addressed professional development issues. Separate committees exist at 12 districts (33.3 percent) for two or more employee groups including four districts (11.1 percent) that maintain separate committees for four different employee groups. Fifteen districts (41 percent) have a separate committee for full-time faculty with only three of these districts maintaining no additional separate committees for other employee groups. A separate committee to assist with professional development activities for classified staff existed in 30.6 percent of the districts, and a separate committee for administrators was found in 16.7 percent of the districts. Based on responses to the survey instrument, it was not possible to determine whether the committees identified above existed for general purposes or for the exclusive consideration of professional development issues.

Conclusions

Nearly all districts are providing some form of professional development activity. For the 28 professional development activities listed on the survey form, each activity was offered for full-time faculty and administrators by one or more college districts. However, very few districts offered a wide variety of professional development activities for all employee groups,

Illinois Community College Board

Table 8

ROLE OF COMMITTEES IN DISTRICT
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY PLANNING

Dist. No.	District	No Committee	One Committee All Groups	SEPARATE COMMITTEE					
				Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Administrators	Other Professionals	Classified Staff	Other
501	Kaskaskia	X							
502	DuPage			X	X	X		X	
503	Black Hawk		X						
504	Triton		X						
505	Parkland		X						
506	Sauk Valley	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
507	Danville			X		X			
508	Chicago	X							X
509	Elgin			X					
510	South Suburban					X			
511	Rock Valley		X	X	X			X	
512	Harper		X						
513	Illinois Valley			X				X	
514	Illinois Central		X						
515	Prairie State			X		X		X	
516	Waubonsee		X	X	X	X	X	X	
517	Lake Land		X						
518	Carl Sandburg			X				X	
519	Highland		X	X					
520	Kankakee			X			X	X	
521	Rend Lake			X				X	
522	Belleville	X							
523	Kishwaukee		X	X	X		X	X	
524	Moraine Valley			X	X	X	X		
525	Joliet		X						
526	Lincoln Land		X						
527	Morton			X					
528	McHenry	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
529	Illinois Eastern	X							
530	Logan		X						
531	Shawnee	X							X
532	Lake County		X					X	
533	Southeastern		X						
534	Spoon River		X						
535	Oakton			X	X			X	
536	Lewis & Clark	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
537	Richland	X							
539	John Wood		X						
601	State Comm. Coll.	X							
	TOTALS	7	17	15	6	6	4	11	2

DNA = Data Not Available

although some did not restrict their offerings to just traditional activities such as conferences, workshops and tuition waivers. Those college districts with appointed directors and established centers or offices for professional development offered a wide variety of activities ranging from 17 to 26 different activities per district. Such activities as planned retreats, visiting exemplary programs, master teachers/mentors, professional growth plans, and special programs for wellness and computer literacy were prevalent in those districts.

All but one community college district provided some type of professional development activities for their professional and classified staff, with the most common practices including professional travel, tuition waivers for courses at their home college, and on-campus workshops. Fewer professional development activities were offered by all districts for part-time faculty than for any other employee group.

Over half of the colleges fund the professional development activities through a line item in the department/division budget and from the college general operating fund, using less than one percent of the fund for that purpose. DAVTE grants also were commonly used funds for professional development activities.

In general, significant evaluation of professional development activities is not being conducted in most districts and, therefore, it is difficult to determine the effectiveness or the impact of the activities on the institutional goals/objectives for professional development. Methods of evaluation which only include informal feedback, informal questionnaires, and written reports by participants usually focus on the participants' reaction to the activities and not on the impact or outcomes.

Organizationally, only 22 college districts indicated they have a formal professional development program. Four districts have appointed a director, coordinator, or assistant to vice president for professional development. Another three districts provide a center for professional development, each with a director. The majority of the districts do have one or more committees to assist with the professional development activities. Several districts indicated that given adequate financial support, a more cohesive formal professional development program could be offered.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the ICCB staff recommends the following:

1. Each college should organize a faculty and staff development program designed to include all employees of the college.

2. Community colleges should ensure that adequate professional development activities for orientation, skills development, and renewal are provided for part-time faculty.

3. Colleges should give more attention to evaluating their professional development programs to ensure that these programs are achieving their objectives.

4. The ICCB should request special state funding designed to assist the community colleges in developing and maintaining professional development programs.

5. The ICCB should develop a process for colleges to report their professional development activities and the costs associated with these activities on an annual basis.

APPENDIX

ICCB PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Illinois Community College Board

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

1. As defined in this survey, does your college have a formal professional development program?

   22 Yes 14 No

2. Does your college informally conduct professional development activities?

   32 Yes 4 No

3. Indicate the number of years professional development activities have been conducted for the following employee groups. (Use a zero if no activities have been conducted.)

Informal Activities Number of Years	Formal Program Number of Years	
4-63	4-21	Full-time teaching faculty
3-63	1-19	Part-time teaching faculty
5-63	3-21	Administrative staff
4-63	2-20	Other (non-teaching) professionals
4-63	2-16	Classified staff

4. Provide the title of the primary person who coordinates the college's overall professional development program.

   Title: _____

5. Do committee(s) advise or assist with professional development activities?

   7 No committee exists.

   17 One committee represents all groups (describe composition-titles, number of people).

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____ Separate committees for:
   - 15 Full-time teaching faculty
   - 6 Part-time teaching faculty
   - 6 Administration
   - 4 Other (non-teaching) professionals
   - 11 Classified staff

   _____ Other (Please specify) 2 _____

6. What employee groups participated in the following professional development activities during fiscal year 1987. (Check all that apply.)

Full-time Teaching Faculty	Part-time Teaching Faculty	Administrators	Other (Non-Teaching) Professionals	Classified	Not Applicable	
21	1	18	15	12		Financial support for courses at other colleges/universities
31	10	27	28	33		Tuition waiver for courses at own college
28	23	25	26	24		College personnel conducted on-campus workshops
28	19	27	24	24		Outside expert conducted on-campus workshops
28	18	27	24	18		On-campus conference/ attendance/presentation
32	12	33	29	21		Off-campus conference/ attendance/presentation
23	2	21	13	7		Visit exemplary programs
5	1	2	1	2		Faculty exchanges with other colleges
9	3	17	4	4		Planned retreats
18	15	17	15	8		Current professional library
10	8	4	4	1		Master teacher/mentor
22	5	23	14	6		Professional membership dues
32	7	33	30	16		Professional travel funds
28	22	21	20	19		Beginning of the year orientation for new personnel
11	3	1	3	2		Videotape evaluation of instruction
24	21	24	23	24		Newsletter (In-house)
26	0	11	5	1		Paid sabbatical leave
17	0	7	4	0		Mini-sabbatical paid leave (less than one year)
22	1	11	13	7		Release time for professional development (paid)
14	1	5	5	4		Unpaid leave for professional development
20	0	1	4	0		Return-to-industry or industry-education exchanges
9	0	1	2	0		Internships
12	0	5	6	1		Professional growth plan or contract
27	13	21	19	15		Inservice day(s) or specific calendar day(s) designated for professional development activities
19	15	19	19	20		Wellness program
24	14	19	17	18		Computer literacy program
2	0	15	3	3		Management development program
11	0	3	5	0		College funded research grants
4	3	4	3	1		Other (please specify) _____
4	1	4	2	1		_____
2	1	1	1	1		_____

7. For fiscal year 1987 (1986-87 academic year), indicate the estimated number of participants and the estimated dollar amount spent overall and for each of the listed professional development activities. If there are other activities where a large percentage of the college's professional development monies are spent, please list that information in the space listed for other responses.

Full-time Teaching Faculty		Part-time Teaching Faculty		Administrators		Other (Non-Teaching) Professionals		Classified		
Number of Participants	Dollars Spent	Number of Participants	Dollars Spent	Number of Participants	Dollars Spent	Number of Participants	Dollars Spent	Number of Participants	Dollars Spent	
DATA NOT AVAILABLE										Total for all professional development activities
										Professional Travel
										Sabbatical
										Professional dues/Journal subscriptions
										On-campus workshops/ conferences
										Graduate courses
										Other (please specify)

8. Please check the rewards and incentives used to encourage participation in the college's professional development activities during fiscal year 1987.

Full-time Teaching Faculty	Part-time Teaching Faculty	Administrators	Other (Non-Teaching) Professionals	Classified	Not Applicable	
20	8	18	19	13		Participation is required
25	4	13	20	14		Released time
16	4	5	10	1		Monetary stipends
9	2	4	5	2		Part of the evaluation process for promotion/tenure
3	2	1	3	1		Merit pay
19	2	2	8	4		Advancement on the salary schedule/salary increases
10	7	9	11	9		Certificate of participation
11	4	3	9	4		Formal letter or document placed in participant's personnel file
3	2	4	4	3		Other (Please specify)
0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	1	0		

9. How does the college budget for professional development activities? (Check one.)

2	No provision in the budget for professional development.
19	Line item budget by department/division.
12	One single institutional line item.
15	Other (Please specify.) _____

_____.

10. Please list the amount and source of monies for the college's professional development activities during fiscal year 1987. See Table 6 of report.

Amount	Source
$_____	College General Operating Fund
$_____	DAVTE QAP Grant
$_____	DAVTE Adult Education
$_____	DAVTE VIP Grant
$_____	ICCB Disadvantaged Student Grant
	Other (Please specify.)
$_____	_____
$_____	_____
$_____	_____

11. What percent of the total fiscal year 1987 college operating budget do professional development expenditures represent? (Check one.)

1	None	0	5% to 7%
22	Under 1%	0	8% to 10%
13	1% to 4%	0	Over 10%

12. How are professional development activities evaluated? (Check all that apply.)

2	No evaluation	16	Observation
31	Informal feedback	3	Test scores
27	Questionnaire	4	Other (Please explain.)
24	Written report by participant	3	_____
		0	_____
7	Interview		_____
5	Records, logs, diaries		

13. If current professional development activities are <u>not evaluated</u>, why are they not evaluated?

Additional comments, explanations, etc.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges DEC 16 1988